

REMARKS

Applicants acknowledge that claims 1-10 have been allowed.

In the advisory action of October 25, 2006, the Examiner indicated that the rejection of claims 11, 12 and 14, as anticipated by Singh, would be maintained. Specifically, the Examiner stated that the claims remain rejected because “Applicants have not supplied evidence demonstrating that the compositions of the prior art necessarily have impurity content outside the limitations of the instant claims.” This rejection is traversed.

Singh discloses producing a paste using only typical roll milling. Pastes produced by typical roll-milling are provided in Comparative Examples 1-3 of Applicants’ specification. As shown in Comparative Examples 1-3, producing pastes by typical roll-milling produces pastes with 60-200 mg of foreign substance, which is outside the range claimed in claim 11.

Singh does not disclose a method for further reducing the level of foreign substance below the levels obtained in Comparative Examples 1-3. This shows that typical roll-milling methods, as disclosed in Singh, would not inherently produce a paste with the claimed amount of foreign substance. In addition, Singh does not disclose or suggest any reason to modify the typical-roll milling methods utilized in Comparative Examples 1-3. Accordingly, it would not be obvious to modify the methods disclosed in Singh to obtain a paste with the claimed amount of foreign substance.

Since Singh does not disclose or suggest a method of obtaining a paste less than 15 mg per 20 kg of foreign substance, the rejection of claims 11, 12, and 14 in view of Singh should be withdrawn.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is

determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing docket no.

360842010500.

Dated: November 17, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Jonathan Bockman

Registration No.: 45,640
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300
McLean, Virginia 22102
(703) 760-7769